REMARKS

In the June 6, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 were pending in the application and rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the BEA Product Family Overview of July 2, 2001 (hereinafter BEA). Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 remain pending in the case. The rejection is traversed below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by BEA.

Claim 1 recites "a contribution receiving part receiving a contribution from the user and storing the contribution in said reference information storage part" (lines 9 and 10). In rejecting this feature, the previous Office Action stated that "a user can configure information in user profile, which allows the personalized server to retrieve personalized contents from the provider" (see page 4). The outstanding Office Action states that the "Examiner asserts that ('range of properties can be defined'. Page 17, section properties and property sets. And 'to specify'. Page 15, section content retrieval) read on applicant's contribution receiving part" (page 2). The rejections are substantially the same. In the previous Amendment, the Applicant argued that configuring a profile is not "receiving a *contribution* from the user" as recited, for example, on line 9 of claim 1. The Examiner has not provided any reasoning for maintaining his rejection in the face of this traversal. The Applicant reminds the Examiner that per 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(b), an Examiner's answer must be "complete as to all matters". The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide explicit reasoning if he continues to maintain the rejection. Further arguments are presented below.

The section of BEA cited in the Office Action per the above discusses the notion of a "property set". As defined in BEA, a property set "is a construct to help group properties that are related to each other" (page 17). However, a "property set" as described in BEA is not a "contribution from the user" as recited in claim 1. As a nonlimiting example, user contributions could be, for instance, "electronic mails" or "Web contributions" (see, for example, page 9, lines 7-20, of the application). BEA, on the other hand, defines properties as "named attributes that may have developer-defined values" (page 17). As such, neither a "property" nor a "property set" as discussed in BEA discloses a "user contribution" as recited in claim 1.

In asserting that the above feature of claim 1 is anticipated by BEA, the Office Action also cites BEA's discussion of "specifying" on page 15. However, specifying is discussed in the context of document retrieval. BEA discusses that:

> WebLogic Personalization Server provides the functionality to define what content is retrieved from a content management system. This functionality, called content selectors, specifies which documents are retrieved from both content and document management systems. A document is a graphic, a segment of HTML or plain text, or a file that must be viewed with a plug-in.

(Page 15). Thus, BEA discusses specifying which documents are **retrieved**. Further, Pages 14, 15 and 17 of BEA contain the headings "What is Personalization", "Content Retrieval and Content Management" and "Properties and Property sets", respectively. These sections merely discuss configurations by which contents can be delivered based on user properties. Nowhere does BEA disclose **receiving a contribution from the user**, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites "a reference range defining part referring to the reference range defining information stored for a user by said reference range defining information storage part and defining a range of the reference information stored by said reference information storage part, in which range the reference information is available for the user to refer to" (lines 5-8). The Office Action asserts that page 14 of BEA discloses a "reference range" (see page 2). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

BEA states that:

> Personalization is the means by which content developers can tailor an application to a particular individual or group based on any number of criteria. The criteria can be predefined user attributes such as age and gender, or can be based on behavioral information gathered as the user navigates a site ... You can customize what content gets delivered based on individual user profiles.

(Page 14). Per the above, the cited section of BEA discusses using criteria to tailor content to a particular group or individual. However, the cited section is completely silent as to a reference range.

On page 17, BEA discusses that "[p]roperty sets are often associated with objects that extend *configurableEntity*, to describe the valid range of properties for that object." In other words, property sets define the range of **properties** for an EJB entity object type that extends the class *configurableEntity*. Claim 1, on the other hand, recites that the reference range is the range in which the "**reference information** is available for the user to refer to" (lines 7 and 8). As a nonlimiting example, a reference range may be, for instance, a "range of information" for which a "keyword search is applied" (see, for example, page 9, line 21 through page 10, line 6,

11

of the application). Hence, a range of "properties" as defined in BEA does not disclose a "reference range" as recited in claim 1. Thus, the BEA reference does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 9, 17 and 33 also recite referring to the reference range defining information stored for a user and receiving a contribution from a user. Thus, claims 9, 17 and 33 are also distinguishable over the BEA reference per the arguments above for claim 1.

Claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-32 and 35-40 each depend from claim 1, 9, 17 or 33 and add further limitations thereto. Therefore, these claims also distinguish over the BEA reference for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 41 recites "making accessible a range of information that is less than all of the information and meeting the applied information management rule so as to define and make available a range of information that is suitable for each user" and "receiving and storing a contribution from a user" (lines 5-8). Thus, claim 41 is also distinguishable over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Summary

It is submitted that the cited art does not suggest or teach the features of the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 are in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _11-6 - 2007_   By: _____

Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501